

Meeting Minutes

April 1, 2025, 9:00 AM

Video Recording Available at: <https://oag.ca.gov/sb882>

In-Person Location for Public Participation:

Attorney General Building
1300 I Street, Room 730
Sacramento, CA 95814

1. Call to Order, Welcome, and Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

Chair Frazier called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council to order at approximately 9:07 am on Tuesday, April 1, 2025, at the Attorney General Building, 1300 I Street, Room 730, Sacramento, CA 95814. Chair Frazier asked **Parliamentarian Johnson** to call the roll to determine whether a quorum was present. All council members attended the meeting remotely.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll to determine whether a quorum was established. Before calling roll, **Parliamentarian Johnson** advised the council members to keep their cameras on and to advise if anyone under the age of 18 was present at their location.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto and Member Emada Tingirides.

Members absent: Member Clifford Phillips

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **8** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was established.

Chair Frazier thanked the council and staff for their work on the council and in the community. He emphasized timeliness and swiftness for today's agenda. With that, he welcomed everybody and moved on to Agenda Item 2, Approval of March 6, 2025 Meeting Minutes. He welcomed any comments or discussion for the meeting minutes.

2. Chair Frazier then moved to Action Item: Approval of March 6, 2025, Meeting Minutes

MOTION:

Vice Chair Zuniga made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for the March 6, 2025 council meeting. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt**.

Chair Frazier called for discussion. After hearing no discussion, **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** call the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Brown, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto, Member Phillips, and Member Tingirides

Nays:
None

Abstentions: Member Braziel

Absent: Member Phillips

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 8 council members present and voting: **7 Ayes, 0 Nays, 1 Abstention**

The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** noted that Agenda Item #3, Public Comment, was specifically set for 9:25 and as it was 9:14, they would return to that item at 9:25, and then moved the meeting to Agenda Item 4: Discussion Item - DOJ Updates on (1) Conflict of Interest Waiver; (2) Pending Legislation; and (3) Training Evaluation.

4. Discussion Item: DOJ Updates on (1) Conflict of Interest Waiver; (2) Pending Legislation; and (3) Training Evaluation.

DAG Ben Conway provided an update on (1) Conflict of Interest Waiver. At an earlier council meeting, the council posed a question regarding whether there is any conflict of interest in council members providing trainings to law enforcement officers while serving on the council, in light of the DOJ's compatibility statement. DOJ granted a waiver to council members of that provision in order to permit the council to fulfill its statutory mandate of evaluating the trainings available to law enforcement while ensuring that council members and their employers are not barred from providing training, sharing their experience, or doing their jobs. This confirmed that council members are free to provide trainings on law enforcement interactions with people with mental health conditions or intellectual and developmental disabilities. Following the presentation, **DAG Conway** and **Chair Frazier** called for discussion or questions from the Council regarding this update. Hearing no discussion, **DAG Conway** proceeded to provide an update on (2) Pending Legislation. Three bills of interest were shared with the Council. The first bill shared was AB 308 from Assemblymember Ramos, regarding developing procedures of mobile crisis teams or units. The second bill shared was AB 1013 from Assemblymember Garcia, regarding developing peace officer training for behavioral health. The last bill shared was SB 664 from Senator Bogh, regarding the development of the Blue Envelope Program by the Department of Motor Vehicles. **DAG Conway** called for discussion or questions from the council regarding this update.

Chair Frazier provided an update, informing the Council that AB 308 was pulled by the author in the last hearing.

Hearing no further discussion, **DAG Conway** proceeded to provide an update on (3) Training Evaluation. Outreach was conducted to over two dozen law enforcement training agencies, and scheduling for council members to attend those trainings has commenced. **DAG Conway** called for discussion or questions from the Council regarding this update.

There was no further discussion following these updates. At the conclusion of Agenda Item 4, Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item 16 to fill the gap before the posted time for Public Comment.

16. Report from the Subcommittee on the Law Enforcement Agencies Survey

Member Libero provided an update on the subcommittee. She confirmed that the survey questions are now finalized and have been tested by both the survey team and Members Burt and Libero. The committee gave final approval for the survey's release, and the survey has since been distributed. DOJ staff sent the survey, its explanation, its background, and its justification to approximately 450

California law enforcement agencies. DOJ staff also sent several reminders to recipients during this time. At the closure of the survey, 156 responses were received, or a 34% response rate. DOJ staff and the subcommittee will move forward with reviewing the responses received from the survey. On initial review, the DOJ Research Services team indicated that there was a large enough sample size to draw generalizable summaries from, which can be included in the report. The DOJ Research Services team will continue their analysis of the responses and will provide a detailed update by the next council meeting in July. At the conclusion of this update, **Member Libero** called for discussion or questions from the council regarding this update.

Chair Frazier thanked and congratulated Member Libero on the response rate.

Member Libero thanked the DOJ Research Services team for their efforts on behalf of the Council.

Hearing no further discussion, noting the time was 9:25, Chair Frazier moved back to Agenda Item 3, Public Comment.

3. Public Comment

Chair Frazier introduced public comment. **DAG Kelly Burns** provided the public comment guidelines. Public comment was scheduled for 20 minutes, from 9:25 a.m. to 9:45 a.m. Each person was designated two minutes to speak, and instead of or in addition to making public comments, members of the public were able to send written comments to sb882@doj.ca.gov. **DAG Burns** noted that to be informed about future meetings, the public can subscribe to council updates via: <https://oag.ca.go/sb882>.

There was one virtual public comment. The comment was from Jessica Kramer, founder of REACH SD, Senior and Disability Advocacy.

Kramer's comments highlighted the work of REACH SD, which was developed in response to 911 interactions with people with disabilities. The organization is made up of people with lived experience and disabilities and works as disability liaisons to several law enforcement agencies in San Diego. Kramer has also served on the county committee for persons with disabilities and the behavioral health advisory board. Through her work, she learned that policies for people with mental health disabilities are very different than the policies for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. As an example, she called attention to how several law enforcement policies still refer to those with mental health disabilities as "mentally disordered" persons. In her experience, she's seen that people with mental health conditions are rooted very quickly into 72-hour holds. She called attention to how Medi-Cal eligible individuals don't have access to therapy or trauma therapy anymore, and so that has resulted in an over-reliance of involuntary medications, and how her organization has become a source of advocacy for those that have become permanently disabled because of these involuntary holds. She emphasized that because of this current system, the burden of care rises dramatically, which in turn leads to less accommodations and protections. She expressed a desire to see a more dignified response around mental health, including an improvement in ADA accommodations. She acknowledged the strides taken with the Blue Envelope Program but pointed out its voluntary participation and its challenges. She also noticed that people with mental health disabilities are not considered under senior and disability protections, such as the Senior and Disability Justice Act, and the senior and disability victimization policies that are mandated by POST.

There were no other public commenters.

Chair Frazier transitioned to Agenda Item #17 while keeping the public comment period open for members of the public to comment if they wished. Public comment officially ended at 9:52 am by **DAG Burns**.

17. Discussion, and Potential Action Items: Presentation, Discussion and Potential Approval of Draft Detailed Outline for Final Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council, Pursuant to SB 882 (Final Report)

DAG Conway publicly shared his screen while revising the draft detailed outline with the addition of council members' comments. The council members reviewed the draft detailed outline. **DAG Burns** provided a summarized review of the draft outline and guided the discussion.

Discussion:

Member Burt requested that input from the public commenter referencing the Senior and Disability Act, or Senate Bill 338, be added in Section III, "The Rights of Individuals with Mental Health, Intellectual, and Developmental Disabilities", to cover any potential training or requirements for individuals with intellectual/developmental or mental health disorders within the report.

DAG Burns provided instruction on how members of the public can access ASL interpretation for the meeting.

Member Burt inquired whether voluntary treatment options will be included under Section IV under subsection (a)iii of the "Lanterman Petris Short Act", as some counties have additional resources for voluntary placements.

DAG Burns, in response to Member Burt's inquiry, expressed that she had intended to include this topic under subsection (a)ii, "Community based systems", because of its broader subject.

Member Burt, in response to **DAG Burns**, requested that the topic of emerging and best practices in a variety of settings be added under the subsection.

Chair Frazier inquired if there was any component within the outline that would provide a direction or path for funding for these implementations. He requested that this component be included in the outline, because it is not possible to accomplish mandates and guidance without funding. He suggested further discussions with relevant agencies that have a role in funding considerations and inquired if the execution of the recommendations would instead require a formal budget request that is included in the report. **Chair Frazier** asked for additional input for other council members that are within law enforcement and how they might engage in additional funding streams.

Vice Chair Zuniga, in response to **Chair Frazier**, shared that in her work for AB 911, the Manny Alert Act, a feasibility study found that potential funding was found from a previous bill. She mentioned that this could also be applied to the community-based systems subsection and potential funding streams.

Member Brazier suggested looking at considerations in several different areas. First, he identified funding as a consideration. Second, he identified availability of training in different areas, with training being more accessible to those in metropolitan areas than those that are in more remote areas. Third, he identified staffing, reiterating that it would be more difficult to train those that are located in more remote areas. In regard to training, he called attention to what's currently available, such as virtual online training or in-person training.

Chair Frazier requested that an accountability component be added into the report that will detail what has been accomplished. He echoed Member Braziel's emphasis on consistency across the state, and the importance of identifying geographical differentials.

At 9:51 A.M., **DAG Burns**, with approval of the Council, suspended discussion with respect to Agenda Item #17 when advised that the time set for the Agenda Item #3, Public Comment, had ended, and the panelists for Agenda Item #5 were scheduled for 10:00 A.M. **Chair Frazier** transitioned to Agenda Item #6, Break, and stated that they would transition back to Agenda Item #5 upon re-establishment of a quorum.

Break

Action Item: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

Chair Frazier called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 10:00 A.M.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll to determine whether a quorum was established.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto and Member Emada Tingirides.

Members absent: Member Clifford Phillips

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **8** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

5. Discussion Item: Presentation on Criminal Justice Involvement among Individuals with Serious Mental Illnesses, and Some Potential Solutions

- **Panelists: Dr. Michael Compton, Columbia University Vagelos College of Physicians & Surgeons and Dr. Amy Watson, Wayne State University School of Social Work**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: Dr. Compton and Dr. Watson discussed the goals of their research over the past 20 years, and their focus on the over-involvement of law enforcement among people with serious mental illnesses (SMI). They highlighted not only the systemic barriers to people with SMI face, but also their experiences. From their research, they identified the main causes of arrests of people with SMI and the kinds of charges that people with SMI often receive. Dr. Compton and Dr. Watson introduced the "sequential intercept model" and the different stages of interception for people with SMI. In studying this, they gathered data on different types of crisis response models and client preferences. At the conclusion of their presentation, they highlighted important strategies that can be adopted at later intercepts to divert people from the criminal legal system.

Discussion:

Member Braziel asked the panelists if they were able to identify when the best time would be to give tenured officers CIT training. He asked whether it would be best to structure it earlier in their career or mid-career.

Dr. Compton, in response, stated that he had found that more seasoned officers with more years of service had done a better job at retaining CIT-related knowledge in his study. He said that there is a current ongoing randomized trial that aims to identify specific years of service. Beyond the evidence, he believed that officers with more years of service were in a better state of mind to benefit from CIT training, as opposed to newer recruits that were still within the academy. He added that one of CIT's core values is to allow officers to self-select into the program, which is in opposition against the perspective of training all officers as a part of the academy curriculum.

Member Braziel expressed support for the programs CAHOOTS (Crisis Assistance Helping Out On The Streets) and STAR (Denver Support Team Assisted Response). He asked the panelists whether they would consider them to fall under traditional law enforcement response, traditional EMS response, or a separate third category.

Dr. Watson responded, stating that CAHOOTS was funded by the police department but as a separate response. She stated that although STAR had moved around, it is talked about as a separate option from police or EMS and fire.

Member Braziel, as a follow-up, asked the panelists if they believe that separating STAR and CAHOOTS from traditional categories and having its own separate function would be the ideal model.

Dr. Watson replied, affirming that having a separate branch of first response would make the most sense and would further support the idea that these programs are sustainable and important. She added that it is also an ADA issue of providing an appropriate response instead of resorting to alternative responses that are not designed for behavioral health crises.

Member Burt asked the panelists whether it was the 40-hour or 8-hour CIT training that they referenced in their study.

Dr. Watson replied that the CIT training model is 40 hours. She acknowledged that there are some trainings that are less than 40 hours but are labeled as CIT, but their study specifically examined the 40-hour trainings.

Member Burt asked if there was any research on online versus in-person training.

Dr. Watson responded that they have not personally done any research on that. However, she acknowledged that there are certain components in CIT that can be very helpful in informing the officer, one component being roleplaying. Although Dr. Watson had not personally examined any research that looks to moving CIT training online, she believed that there are good justifications to having CIT training in-person.

Member Burt asked the panelists if they could clarify how they defined crisis response, and if it was used to describe someone who was, for example, committing a crime versus feeling suicidal or experiencing a meltdown.

Dr. Watson, in response, acknowledged that when someone experiences a mental health crisis, there could be aspects of the situation that someone may define as a crime. In the case of the study, it was defined as someone experiencing a mental health crisis, and what that response was like.

Dr. Compton added that in the context of mental health crises, law enforcement officers are default responders and are able to utilize arrest as a tool. He believed that this is another reason as to why we need to shift the responsibility of crisis response away from law enforcement. He added that it is only

fair that someone that is experiencing a mental health crisis receives a medical type response, as someone with chest pain would.

Member Burt called attention to the cycle of the 5150 hold, in which individuals are transported to emergency rooms and get released, only for the cycle to continue. She asked if this cycle was included within their framework.

Dr. Compton responded, agreeing that the cycle was an indicator that there's a break in the continuum of care for that individual, as they struggle to maintain stability and pursue recovery within their community. He pointed out that this cycle involves not only the hospital, but also jails and homelessness. These are the 3 areas of the cycle that are common for those with SMI.

Dr. Watson added that many of these models are aiming to do more follow-ups with people, including using certified peers to do this engagement and follow-up. Through research, she has heard that police officers have expressed frustration that mental health systems aren't providing enough support and follow-up for people with SMI and so they end up seeing them again. Although emerging models are working to incorporate them, there is a question of whether the resources exist to address it adequately.

Member Petteruto, talking about the Denver Star program, observed the statistic of a 34% decrease in misdemeanor crime. She asked the panelists if they considered all possible causes for the decrease, such as whether the lack of police presence as a first response or whether being better connected to more resources influenced the decrease.

Dr. Watson, in response, clarified that there is common assumption that the 34% decrease is a decrease in actual crime, but the statistic actually indicates misdemeanor crime. A police officer who is responding is responsible for that classification, so if police aren't responding, then it's not happening. She acknowledged that the article can be misleading, but the study suggests that if you don't send police, then some of these situations aren't defined by a crime. Further research is needed to investigate if sending somebody else actually provides an intervention that reduces the likelihood of subsequent contacts and reports.

Chair Frazier stated that when discussing the cycle of crisis, it should be considered that there is also no capacity for crisis beds, leading to increased arrests and reroutes to similar facilities. He added that without a place for people to land, the cycle will repeat, and therefore there should be a parallel path that creates additional capacity to meet the general demand. He also stated that the safety of responding individuals should be considered, and how we can improve interactions without jeopardizing safety. Chair Frazier asked if the panelists had any thoughts on the safety component of this piece.

Dr. Watson replied that they currently have an ongoing project in which the interview people working in civilian response as well as people who utilize crisis services about their safety. Through this project, she found that one of the most important pieces was prepping the responder by training them to maintain safety and make good assessments while also recognizing when to disengage and ask for more support. She also noticed development in triage protocols across the country, where call operators are trained to ask more questions about safety. Currently, we are seeing communities try to find a solution to these issues, but she believed that it is possible to maintain safety if responders are adequately prepped and ensured an exit.

There were no further questions from the Council. Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item 6, Break.

6. Break, 11:00-11:10 am

7. Action Item: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

Chair Frazier called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 11:10 A.M.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll to determine whether a quorum was established.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Braziel, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto and Member Emada Tingirides.

Members absent: Member Olwyn Brown, Member Clifford Phillips

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **7** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

8. Discussion Item: Presentation on AB 988 Five-Year Implementation Plan

- **Panelist: Dr. Anh Thu Bui, California Health and Human Services Agency**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: Dr. Anh Thu Bui is the project director for the AB 988 crisis continuum, working on the 5-year implementation plan for AB 988. 988 is designated as the three-digit national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline number. Dr. Bui provided an overview on the development of the implementation plan for 988. She also provided a glimpse of what we currently have in terms of crisis response in California. She shared data that was collected on certain populations of focus, including individuals that are high risk of crisis response, such as individuals with mental health conditions as well as intellectual/developmental disabilities.

Discussion:

Member Tingirides asked whether the 12 different agencies that have 988 centers all report to one database. Additionally, she wondered if this included nonprofit organizations, government organizations, and wanted a better understanding of how the 988 system looked in execution so that it can be implemented across more entities.

Dr. Bui responded that participating organizations are currently required to report certain measures to the national network administrator run by SAMHSA, and some states have federal grants in which they are required to report certain data to SAMHSA. She clarified that as of this moment, they have not yet developed a set of statewide measures for California. Now, in data metrics, they are trying to determine what statewide measures are needed to sustainably fund these 988 centers while also maintaining quality services.

Member Burt mentioned that there's a lot of confusion when it comes to behavioral and mental health within the autism community. She requested further clarification for how 988 may be applied to families that have a member that is dysregulated and potentially aggressive.

Dr. Bui, in response, acknowledged that there are aspects of 988 that they are currently performing well in, but also acknowledged that there is a future aspirational vision of what else can be done given this opportunity. Although suicide crisis is covered well, behavioral crisis is a very broad category that they are continuing to expand quality of services for. This potentially looks like more training to serve particular populations, such as individuals with autism. For smaller 988 centers, we

need to identify and evaluate where they're at and determine how best to support them to get them there.

Member Burt asked if 988 is anonymous. Dr. Bui's presentation discussed Medi-Cal billing and being able to bill to other insurers. Member Burt requested for clarification, as many people within the autism community hold a lot of fears regarding calling in, fearing that adult protective services or child family services may become involved.

Dr. Bui confirmed that 988 is both a free and confidential service, and that there is no requirement to provide any identifying information to receive the service. However, the phone number is visible, and geo-routing occurs for 80% of mobile numbers so that callers will be connected to the closest 988 center. All other demographic data is voluntary, and most of the time they do not have any data demographically.

There were no further questions from the Council. **Chair Frazier** moved to Agenda Item 9, Presentation by Vinny Eng; Nonprofit Director, Advocate & Brother of Jazmyne Ha Eng.

9. Discussion Item: Presentation by Vinny Eng, Nonprofit Director, Advocate & Sibling of Jazmyne Ha Eng

- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: Vinny Eng is the American-born child of Cambodian refugees, who currently lives in San Francisco and serves as the interim executive director of Open House, an aging services nonprofit organization. Their sister, Jazmyne Ha Eng, was killed by L.A. County Sheriffs in 2012 at a community mental health clinic. They brought attention to the federal Department of Health and Human Services' announcement that SAMHSA and ACL will effectively cease to exist. Vinny shared their personal path with advocacy, and how it all began when their sister was killed when she was experiencing a mental health crisis. In addition to this work, Vinny also fought for fair access to the California victim compensation fund, which is state-run, last resort financial resource for families impacted by violence, which is inaccessible to individuals recovering from police violence. Vinny is also a part of several support networks of families affected by police violence in California and continues to advocate for change in policy. Vinny provided some recommendations and guidance to the Council in writing the report.

Discussion:

Member Burt thanked Mx. Eng for sharing their perspective and expressed condolences for the loss of their sister.

Chair Frazier thanked Mx. Eng for sharing and the work their continued involvement of helping others. He asked Mx. Eng to continue following the Council's progress and to keep offering recommendations.

Mx. Eng responded, stating that they've been an advocate since 2012. Although it's been 13 years, there continues to be similar conversations. Progress is slow, but they believe that investments in these programs must be made because over 200 Californians die every year at the result of police violence.

There were no further questions from the Council. **Chair Frazier** moved to Agenda Item 10, Lunch.

10. Lunch Break 12:30-1:30 pm

11. Action Item: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

Chair Frazier called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 1:35 P.M.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll to determine whether a quorum was established.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Jim Frazier, Member Rick Braziel, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto and Member Emada Tingirides.

Members absent: Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Olwyn Brown, Member Clifford Phillips.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **6** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

12. Discussion Item: Presentation on Alternatives to Law Enforcement Response to Mental Health Calls

- **Panelist: Monica Porter Gilbert, Bazelon Center**
- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: Ms. Porter Gilbert is an attorney at Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, whose mission to protect the civil rights of adults and children with mental health and developmental disabilities. She discussed the importance of dispatching mental health responses to mental health calls, different mental health response programs and their effectivity, and the harms associated with unnecessary police response to mental health emergencies. She covered the legal framework and current legal landscape that is relevant to the civil rights of those with mental health and developmental disabilities. Additionally, she discussed relevant statistics and current limitations of both the co-response model and police training.

Discussion:

Member Tingirides mentioned that one part of Los Angeles's difficulties is having a co-response model in which a mental health clinician rides with a police officer. They finally have enough resources to provide this service on a 24/7 basis, but there's difficulty in hiring or getting social workers to engage in that type of work. She asked if there has been any studies or interest from licensed social workers so that it doesn't have to be a co-response model, and it could just be those individuals. Additionally, she asked, based on the research that has been done, are those individuals being dispatched when there is a weapon involved, but there is a mental health crisis present?

Ms. Porter Gilbert responded to the second question, stating that she has been speaking with a jurisdiction in which everyone has a firearm on them. They found that it is a very individualized determination for each community in terms of how that response will look like. She referenced a link to a brief that the Bazelon Center recently filed in Louisville. She summarized, stating that it is dependent on the jurisdiction and this is a situation in which starting small with pilots then scaling up would be helpful. Some jurisdictions would begin with wellness checks where there's no weapons present and would scale up from there. The presence of a weapon and its role in the situation would need to be assessed and might require a different response. In response to Member Tingirides's question about hiring, Ms. Porter Gilbert acknowledged that it was a difficult question to answer. For

now, call centers can help to alleviate some of the burden, but she acknowledged that it isn't the answer and that hiring can be difficult. She encouraged looking into loan forgiveness programs and lowering financial barriers to enter the profession, plus support that would be needed to encourage individuals to stay. Ms. Porter Gilbert stated that she would have to look into additional notes in regard to this but would be happy to stay in contact to discuss more on this matter.

There were no further questions from the Council. **Chair Frazier** moved to Agenda Item 13.

13. Discussion Item: Presentation by Mae Thornton Mehra, producer of *Being Michelle*, Dr. Mei Kennedy, Delbert Whetter, and Dr. Gabriel Lomas

- **Question and Answer with Advisory Council Members**

A video of this presentation will be posted on the [SB 882 Council website](#).

Summary of presentation: Michelle from *Being Michelle* was born deaf into a hearing family, and she experienced language deprivation for most of her life. Having the ability to communicate with police and with systems was very difficult, especially for Michelle who needs a certified deaf interpreter. With this film, they hope to communicate that access to communication is a basic human right, something in which Michelle never had access to in her interactions with the system. The film highlights different levels of the challenges she encountered. Ms. Thornton Mehra, Mr. Whetter, Dr. Guthmann, and Dr. Lomas provided their own background and perspectives on the topic, especially for accessibility for those with disabilities. A trailer for *Being Michelle* was screen-shared to participants.

Discussion:

Member Libero asked if she could receive a link to the document that Dr. Guthmann had referenced and showed in her presentation with the different communication options.

Dr. Guthmann responded affirmatively, stating that she can share a copy of it to the appropriate party for disbursement.

Chair Frazier thanked the panelists, mentioning that he was present at the preview in Sacramento and hopes to utilize the information shared by today's panelists.

There were no further questions from the Council.

At 3:00 P.M., **Vice Chair Zuniga** noted that she had re-joined at around 2:50 P.M. She noted that her son was present in the room and that she was not able to be on camera during the meeting for disability-related reasons. However, she did cast votes via audio when council votes were called.

Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item 14, Break, and stated that the council would transition back to Agenda Item #17 upon re-establishment of a quorum.

14. Break 3:05-3:15pm

15. Action Item: Reconvening of Meeting and Re-establishment of Quorum

Chair Frazier called the meeting of the SB 882 Advisory Council back to order at 3:15 P.M.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll to determine whether a quorum was established.

Members present, at the time the Roll was called: Chair Jim Frazier, Vice Chair Astrid Zuniga, Member Rick Brazier, Member Elizabeth Burt, Member Lauren Libero, Member Christina Petteruto.

Members absent: Member Olwyn Brown, Member Clifford Phillips, Member Tingirides.

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were **9** members on the Council and **5** members were needed for a quorum. There were **6** members present at the time the roll was called. A quorum was re-established.

17. Discussion, and Potential Action Items: Presentation, Discussion and Potential Approval of Draft Detailed Outline for Final Report of the SB 882 Advisory Council, Pursuant to SB 882 (Final Report), Continued

DAG Conway resumed publicly sharing his screen while revising the draft detailed outline with the addition of council members' comments. The Council members reviewed the draft detailed outline. **DAG Burns** provided a summarized review of the draft outline and guided the discussion.

Discussion:

Member Burt asked if we could include a section that covered the lack of resources and highlight some of the issues associated with that.

Chair Frazier suggested looking into LAO or Little Hoover Commission to see if they have actually looked into the lack of resources or staffing and what potential recommendations they could have made in response to that.

Member Petteruto requested that a section be added to discuss the lack of resources for individuals who are dually diagnosed, as there is a small pool of providers who are willing to work with developmental disabilities.

Member Burt requested that a section regarding deaf plus, or communication-related disabilities, be added. She also called attention to one of the panelists mentioning the barriers of Medi-Cal restricting funding on trauma-informed care.

Chair Frazier added to Member Burt's comment, suggesting that in hindsight of Medi-Cal's funding being cut because of the current political landscape, we should consider a Plan B about what resources can actually be afforded with a drastic reduction in funding.

Member Burt suggested that the topic "Services Outside Regional Centers" be under its own section, as about 20-30% of the population are not Regional Center clients, to ensure that there is a pathway for those that are not eligible for Regional Center services. She also suggested that the report expand more on proactive support and resources that occur before group homes.

Member Petteruto stated that we no longer have developmental centers available, except for in relation to a criminal case. Porterville is the only remaining developmental center, and all facilities that are listed under the "Developmental Centers" section are provided by the Regional Center. Therefore, the facilities listed under "Developmental Centers" should be under "Community Placements". She also expressed that the council should be cognizant of the fact that this is a report that will be digested by the public, and therefore should accurately reflect how the system looks like currently. She suggested reworking the "Lanterman Act, Regional Centers" section to highlight the case management piece of it and to potentially cover the services funded by Regional Center and the generic resources in the community separately.

Member Libero echoed Member Petteruto's comments. She suggested that the bullets "Adult Residential Facilities", "Group Homes for Children", and "Enhanced Behavioral Support Homes" be

listed under Bullet C, “Community Crisis Home”, and renaming the group to “Specialized Residential”. This will allow for more emphasis on the other services that Member Burt mentioned.

Member Burt called attention to the fact that not all Regional Centers may not offer all these services, may be at capacity, or may not provide the same quality of services across all centers. Depending on where the person lives, there is not equal access to resources.

Chair Frazier pointed out that funding is at the will of the legislature. Usually, this population is the first to be cut and the last to be restored.

Member Petteruto asked to confirm whether Bullet 1, Regional Centers, is separated or together with Bullet 2, “Services, Supports, and Resources”. She emphasized that “Services, Supports, and Resources” should be under the “Regional Centers” section, as these resources are all coordinated through the Regional Center.

Member Burt replies to Member Petteruto, stating that it is not always the case, but can be.

Member Petteruto asked for further clarification on whether the topic of discussion for this particular section is services coordinated through the Regional Center, or whether it is generic services.

Chair Frazier asked Member Petteruto, as an example, if she was referring to behavioral ABA therapy that private health plans fund in lieu of Regional Center services.

Member Petteruto responded to Chair Frazier affirmatively, adding that generic services could also look like ABA provided by school districts, or counseling through health insurance. As a result, there are potentially 2 categories of services that can be discussed, such as Regional Center services, and other services that are funded by other sources outside of the Regional Center. At the Regional Center, services provided by other agencies are referred to as “generic resources.”

Member Burt mentioned that she has heard a lot from law enforcement that they receive a lot of calls from group homes. She wondered if the intersection between law enforcement and the sources of the calls they receive will be discussed. She considered how some of their recommendations at the end may incorporate some sort of training for group homes or school resource officers.

DAG Burns, in response to Member Burt, stated that this could possibly be included under the “Youth” section. She also noted that the DOJ staff have been looking into inviting witnesses that could speak more into youth issues.

Member Burt suggested that “group home” falls into the adult category, but also suggested that it can also be inclusive of the foster care system.

Member Petteruto mentioned that in many cases, when someone’s behavior in a group home escalates, the home is no longer in a good position to meet the individual’s needs. However, there is a resource barrier in which this individual may not immediately have somewhere to go, creating a complex and challenging situation. She elaborated, stating that another challenge is that sometimes an individual may leave the home to be placed on a hold or be hospitalized, and because of their level of care, they may not be able to return to that home. This further highlights the shortage of resources.

Chair Frazier suggested that we include a directory of services where people could access and help facilitate some of their needs.

Member Burt suggested adding the Diversion Regional Center as a Diversion Program under possible resources. She asked Member Libero and Member Petteruto for confirmation on whether this program was limited to adults or also extends to youth.

Member Petteruto responded, stating for youth cases, the program is called IJCAT, or Inter-agency Juvenile Competency Assessment Team. It is a court-ordered program that is available for not just individuals with IDD, but it is a tool where you can access a group of representatives from all of the agencies that might have resources. All of these agencies come together to prepare a report for the court to determine what services they can provide to that youth to be successful. For the diversion, Member Petteruto had never seen it for a juvenile case, but has seen it frequently for adults. This is when the court orders the Regional Center to make a recommendation as to whether this individual should be placed on a diversion plan and what that plan entails. If the individual follows the plan, the criminal case is suspended, and the charges against them are ultimately dismissed at the end. She also highlighted how competency is another factor that comes up frequently when reviewing criminal cases, and this includes competency training.

Member Petteruto clarified that the Regional Center does not evaluate for competency, it just makes a determination of whether or not the individual has a developmental disability. If the court determines that the individual is not competent, then the Regional Center makes another recommendation as to how the individual should receive competency training.

Member Burt suggested that we separate Interagency Juvenile Competency Assessment Teams from Regional Center diversion programs. She asked Member Petteruto for confirmation.

Member Petteruto replied affirmatively.

Member Burt suggested adding mental health court as a section.

Member Burt, in consideration of the *Being Michelle* panelists, suggested including an area that discusses departmental policies and laws that discuss access to a translation service and how they facilitate effective communication, such as the Blue Envelope voluntary database program.

DAG Burns and **Parliamentarian Johnson** flagged a time concern. **DAG Burns** provided a summary for the rest of the outline in consideration of time.

Member Burt asked where the summary of the law enforcement survey will be included.

DAG Burns responded, stating that it is an open-ended question, as they can discuss how to work the results in once they are received.

Chair Frazier requested that school resource officers be included within a section.

Member Petteruto mentioned that we have heard a lot of different programs from our panelists today, such as the Denver STAR program and programs in other states. She recommended that we look at models that may have been successful outside of California.

There was no further discussion from the Council.

MOTION:

Member Petteruto made a motion to approve the outline as amended, and to authorize the DOJ to make changes as needed, with approval from the Chair and Vice Chair. This motion was seconded by **Vice Chair Zuniga**.

Chair Frazier asked for discussion. After hearing no further discussion, **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** call the roll for the vote on the motion.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Brown, Member Phillips, Member Tingirides

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 6 Advisory Council members present and voting: **6 ayes, 0 Nays.**

The Motion to approve the outline as amended, with authorization given to the DOJ staff to amend the outline, with the approval of the Council Chair and Vice Chair, was passed.

Chair Frazier moved to Agenda Item 18: Action Item - Presenting Next Meeting Dates and Setting Next Meeting Agenda or, Alternatively, Delegating Authority to DOJ to Set Next Meeting Agenda Subject to Approval by the Chair and the Vice-Chair.

18. Action Item: Presenting Next Meeting Dates and Setting Next Meeting Agenda or, Alternatively, Delegating Authority to DOJ to Set Next Meeting Agenda Subject to Approval by the Chair and the Vice-Chair

DAG Burns reported that the DOJ staff has not yet received everyone's availability to set the next meeting date, so we have not yet been able to set a date for the next July meeting yet. **DAG Burns** requested that the Council provide their availability so that the dates for future meetings could be set. **DAG Burns** also requested that the Council delegate authority to the DOJ to set the agenda for the July meeting.

MOTION:

Chair Frazier asked the Council members what their pleasure was.

Member Burt made a motion to delegate authority to the DOJ to set the next meeting agenda, subject to the approval by the Chair and Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by **Member Libero**.

Chair Frazier asked for discussion. Hearing no further discussion, **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** call the roll for the vote on the motion.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll, beginning with **Chair Fraizer**.

Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Brown, Member Phillips, Member Tingirides

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 6 Advisory Council members present and voting: **6 Ayes, 0 Nays**

The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** then moved the meeting to Agenda Item 19: Discussion Item - Closing Remarks by Chair.

19. Discussion Item: Closing Remarks by Chair

Chair Frazier thanked attendees, panelists, and DOJ staff for another successful meeting.

Chair Frazier then moved the meeting to Agenda Item 20: Action Item - Meeting Adjournment.

20. Agenda Item 20: Action Item - Meeting Adjournment.

MOTION:

Member Libero made a motion to adjourn the meeting. This motion was seconded by **Member Burt**.

Chair Fraizer called for discussion. There was no discussion.

After hearing no discussion, **Chair Frazier** requested that **Parliamentarian Johnson** call the roll for the vote on the motion.

Parliamentarian Johnson called the roll: Ayes: Chair Frazier, Vice Chair Zuniga, Member Braziel, Member Burt, Member Libero, Member Petteruto

Nays: None

Absent: Member Brown, Member Phillips, Member Tingirides

Parliamentarian Johnson stated that there were 6 Advisory Council members present and voting: **6 Ayes, 0 Nays**.

The Motion Passed and **Chair Frazier** adjourned the meeting at 4:14 P.M.